

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

The Office Action of January 7, 2009 indicates that the application contains claims that are directed to patentably distinct species which are subject to an Election/Restriction requirement. The Office Action requires the application to be restricted under 35 U.S.C. 121 between two allegedly distinct inventions:

Species 1: Claims 6, 20; and Species 2: Claims 12, 26

NOTE: The Office Action referred to the claims in species 1 as claims "16, 20". However, Applicants believe that claim "16" was intended to be written as claim "6" and, as such, will proceed accordingly.

In the present response, Applicants elect Species 1, claims 6 and 20, **with traverse.**

Election / Restrictions

The Office action indicates that the species are independent or distinct because the claims recite mutually exclusive characteristics of such species. The Office action also indicates that there is an examination and search burden for these patentably distinct species due to their mutually exclusive characteristics, that the species require a different field of search (e.g. searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries); and/or the prior art applicable to one species would not likely be applicable to another species; and/or the species are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claim 6 recites, in part, a voltage supply structure wherein the logic paths are duplicated so that the paths do not share an overlapping portion. Claim 12 recites, in part, a voltage supply structure wherein the logic paths share an overlapping portion. Claims 20 and 26 are method claims which substantially correspond to claims 6 and 12, respectively.

Both claims 6 and 12 (and corresponding method claims 20 and 26) are directed to a voltage supply structure for logic paths in an integrated circuit. While the Office

action alleges the claims are directed to different classes/subclasses, the Office action does not identify which classes or subclasses the claims are alleged to belong to. Furthermore, applicants submit that there is no undue burden on the Office to search and examine claims 6 and 12 (and method claims 20 and 26) together because both claims 6 and 12 are directed towards the same element (i.e. voltage supply structure for logic paths in an integrated circuit).

In addition, Applicants submit that the claims for the identified species 2, i.e. claims 12 and 26, appear to have been misinterpreted. The Office Action indicates that claims 12 and 26 are directed to a voltage supply structure that provides the logic path with a higher voltage which is “appropriate for the delay of the longest path of multiple logic paths” within the integrated circuit.

However, claims 12 and 26 do not recite or refer to different lengths of the logic paths in the integrated circuit and do not recite “appropriate for the delay of the longest path of multiple logic paths.” Thus, Applicants see no reasonable basis to restrict claims 6, 12, 20 and 26.

In view of at least the foregoing, Applicants submit that the Election/Restriction requirement is not required. Withdrawal of the Election/Restriction requirements is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian S. Myers/
By: Brian S. Myers
Registration No.: 46,947
973-401-7157

Please direct all correspondence to:

Larry Liberchuk, Esq.
Senior Counsel
U.S. PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001